

31 Jan 09 14:03

Gosling

49-30-31952637

S.13

13

AMMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 02 2009

14

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 02 2009

Claims

What is claimed is:

1. (Original) A system and method to give a true indication of respondent satisfaction to an electronic questionnaire survey which is characterised by asking the respondent or plurality of respondents to give their answers to two sets of questions with both sets of questions being based on similar statements, but posed differently, so that the first set of questions are answered emotionally by the respondent and the second set of questions are answered rationally, ranking the responses to both sets of questions and comparing the rankings from both sets of questions.
2. (Original) A method according to claim 1 of subdividing the subject matter of the said questionnaire survey into common groups in which the said statements are equally distributed in number amongst the groups.
3. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1 of defining two sets of said similar statements in which both sets of statements contain sentences with the same meaning, but using different words so that the first set can be used in a set of questions designed to be responded to emotionally and the second set can be combined to answer the questions rationally.
4. (Withdrawn) A method according to claim 1 of defining one set of said questions in which the said first set of statements can be assessed by the respondent simply and quickly by using a limited number of response possibilities, thereby allowing the respondent to respond emotionally to the said statements.
5. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 1 of defining a second set of said questions in which the said questions dynamically group together a number of statements from the said second set of statements at the time of questionnaire.

6. (Original) A method according to claim 5 of grouping together a number of statements from the said second set of statements in which the said statement groupings depend upon the respondent's answers to the first set of questions.
7. (Original) A method according to claim 5 in which the said questions are defined so that the respondent is forced to respond rationally to the said group of statements.
8. (Currently amended) A method according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking the said responses to the said first set of questions in which the respondent's emotional response has a value calculated, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of the respondent's emotional responses to the said questions and then ranked.
9. (Currently ammended) A method according to claim 1 of scoring and ranking the said responses to the said second set of questions in which the respondent's rational response has a value calculated, which represents the level of conviction (also known as the "weighting") of the respondent's rational responses to the said questions and then ranked.
10. (Original) A method according to claim 1 of comparing the emotional and rational responses from the respondent or plurality of respondents in which the closeness of match of emotional and rational responses is quantifiably measured, thereby giving a value for respondent or plurality of respondents' satisfaction.
11. (Cancelled)
12. (Cancelled)
13. (Previously Presented) A system and method of having stored responses to the first part of a questionnaire in a system, which is either stand alone or part of a network in its broadest sense, from an input device, the said responses are processed in a central processing unit in the said system and based on the results, the questions for the second part of the questionnaire are dynamically arranged and presented on a display device to the respondent for completion; after which the respondent's resulting input on the said input device is once again registered and processed in the said processing unit and finally stored in a storage device. At this stage a

summary of the respondent's results can be presented to the respondent in both a textual and graphical format on the said display device.

14. (Cancelled)

15. (Original) A method according to claim 13 of giving the respondent immediate feedback in which a textual and/or graphical summary of their input is shown immediately on the said display device following their completion of the electronic questionnaire survey.

16. (Cancelled)

17. (Cancelled)

18. (Cancelled)

19. (Previously Presented) A system, either standalone or part of a network in its broadest sense, capable of capturing and summarising inputs from a questionnaire survey from a respondent or plurality of respondents such that each questionnaire survey originator is able to see the results not only for their own entity, but also for a plurality of entities, typically in the same industry (consisting of like-minded survey originators) thereby allowing industry wide benchmarking, which, because of the repeatability of the present invention, now becomes possible, for those surveys where such a feature would be beneficial.

20. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 19 of assigning values to the respondents emotional responses which allow a simple summary of emotional responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition.

21. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 19 of assigning values to the respondents rational responses which allow a simple summary of rational responses from a plurality of respondents by using simple addition.

22. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 19 of adding the results of the emotional responses of all respondents in the survey originator's entity as well as their rational responses and comparing the two results, so that values can be mathematically

assigned to both the entity's satisfaction and level of conviction which are representative for the whole entity and are both devoid of human emotion and repeatable.

23. (Previously Presented) A method according to claim 19 of presenting the results from the survey both textually and graphically so that the survey originator sees both a summary of their own entity's results for satisfaction and level of conviction as well as the results of a plurality of entities, thereby allowing an immediate benchmarking.